REMARKS

This paper is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated September 4, 2007, within the three-month period for response. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. In addition, Applicant submits that the amendments made herein do not raise new issues, as the amendments incorporate into the independent claim the subject matter of originally-filed dependent claims 11 and 12, as well as a few additional clarifying amendments suggested by the Examiner.

In the subject Office Action, claims 7-8 and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,560,007 to Thai and U.S. Patent No. 5,560,007 to Ozbutun et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections to the extent that they are maintained. Applicant has canceled claims 11-12 and amended independent claim 7, leaving claims 7-8, 10 and 13-14 still pending. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is being added by the above amendments, as the amendments are fully supported in the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed. Applicant also notes that the amendments made herein are being made only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the aforementioned claimed subject matter. Applicant is not conceding in this application that the originally-claimed subject matter is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, and Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue this and other subject matter in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

As an initial matter, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor for the consideration granted in the personal interview conducted with the undersigned on October 18, 2007. In the interview, Applicant addressed the shortcomings of the new reference to Ozbutun, and to the general patentability of claim 7 over the prior art of record. The Examiner indicated in the interview that amendments to the claims to incorporate the subject matter of claim 12 into claim 7, and to address a few informal issues regarding the claim language in claim 7, would overcome the current rejection. The Examiner also agreed that the amendments (which are consistent with the amendments made herein) would not raise any new issues, and would be entered after final.

Turning now to the Examiner's rejections, the Examiner will note that Applicant has amended claim 7 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 12, and that claims 11 and 12 have been canceled accordingly. Claim 7 has also been amended to address several matters of form for which the Examiner proposed suggested changes.

As discussed in the interview, neither Thai nor Ozbutun, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the concept of, before initializing a bitmap and starting a first task and second task, determining if a query is labeled as a candidate for dynamic bitmap updating, in combination with the other features recited in claim 7. Applicant can find no analogous determination that is performed in either cited reference, and as such, the proposed combination falls short of rendering claim 7 obvious.

In addition, neither reference discloses or suggests a number of other features recited in claim 7. For example, claim 7 requires that both of the first and second tasks be executed for the same query. The Examiner relied on Ozbutun for allegedly disclosing the concept of first and second tasks associated with the same query; however, as Applicant discussed in the interview, Ozbutun includes a multiplicity of tasks that are independent of one another and not associated with any particular query, as the tasks relied upon by the Examiner perform independent updating of elements in a bitmap in response to changes in the underlying data, and not for the purpose of building a bitmap for a particular query.

As another example, claim 7 requires that the bitmap essentially be built by scanning a column of a table using an index, and as such, the claim requires a separate index that is used to build the bitmap. Neither reference discloses or suggests the use of an index to build a bitmap in one task concurrently with accessing records in another task using the bitmap. Ozbutun discloses only a bitmap, and the one bitmap cannot be used to correspond to both of the bitmap and the index recited in claim 7.

Claim 7 is therefore non-obvious over Thai and Ozbutun, and the rejection should be withdrawn. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 7, and of claims 8, 10 and 13-14 which depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

In summary, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the foregoing, or which might otherwise further this case onto allowance, the Examiner may contact the undersigned at (513) 241-2324. Moreover, if any other charges or credits are necessary to complete this communication, please apply them to Deposit Account 23 3000.

Respectfully submitted,

_____October 22, 2007_____
Date

_____/Scott A. Stinebruner/_____
Scott A. Stinebruner
Reg. No. 38,323
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.
2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Telephone: (513) 241-2324
Facsimile: (513) 241-6234